

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

GREETINGS FROM YOUR OFFICERS

The last few months have been a period of readjustment, with a new President and Vice President, and a new alignment of committee duties, which has necessitated the appointment of entirely new committees. The wisdom of the establishment of the position of executive officer has never been more evident than it has been during this transition period. It makes possible a continuity of OPEDA interest and action that otherwise would be quite difficult, if not practically impossible.

The Committee on Economic Criteria, under the energetic leadership of John Sutton, ably assisted by Clement Morrison, has considered a number of legislative proposals and has given the officers their reaction to them. The subject matter in the field of the other committees has been less pressing, but they will be heard from in due time.

It is a pleasure to report that our paid-up membership is now the high-

est on record. On May 31 it was 2,654. The greatest recent increases have been in the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering and in the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. Both of these agencies have recently put on membership campaigns. Farm Credit Administration has held membership luncheons which have resulted in additions to its Washington membership. We are hoping that the Council members from other agencies will undertake drives for membership.

Another hope of your officers is that more regional chapters will be formed. This subject was discussed on page 7 of the last issue of OPEDA.

The working out of plans to meet Budget Bureau cuts, the revision of these plans to meet other cuts made by the House Committee, work on RMA projects, and numerous other things have taken most of our time and energy during the past few months. The pressure can be ex-

pected to ease up a little during the summer and fall, and we hope to then give OPEDA's affairs and interests the time and attention they fully merit.

For the membership in and near Washington we are hoping to have some social affairs this fall—perhaps a dinner or an evening meeting. The Council may also hold a series of luncheon meetings. Suggestions from the membership on such matters would be welcome.

Of main interest to most of us is the status of various legislation affecting our welfare in one way or another. Mr. Kneipp has been in close touch with the legislative situation and has appeared at several hearings. But we'll let him tell his own story of developments on Capitol Hill.

BENNETT A. PORTER,
ERWIN C. ELTING,
WALWORTH BROWN.

MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL AND OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

In addition to its initial meeting of January 18, the OPEDA Council also met in formal session on May 19. Since its election, the OPEDA Executive Committee has held three formal meetings, namely, January 27, March 9, and May 11. Close contact between the current trend of events and the plans and programs of OPEDA has thus been maintained by its governing bodies.

OPEDA STANDING COMMITTEES, 1949

In these busy days, when official duties tax individual time and energy, there is some natural hesitance in assuming the obligation of membership on a standing committee that may have to deal with some quite important issues. But the chairman of OPEDA's four standing committees have been successful in enlisting the interest and service of persons highly qualified to chart courses of OPEDA action that are safe and sane and yet fully promotive of the best interests of OPEDA's members. If or as the need develops, additional members may be added to those committees which now number less than 11 members. The committees, as at present constituted, are as follows:

ECONOMIC CRITERIA

John G. Sutton, Chm.	SCS
C. K. Morrison	FHA
Madge Reese	Ext
R. H. Nelson	E&PQ
Catherine Doherty	FS
Charles N. Mason	PMA
Asa Winters	BAI
I. T. McKillop	REA
Harold A. Stone	B&F
Kenneth L. Bachman	BAE
Russell C. Engberg	FCA

WORKING CRITERIA

John H. Scoltock, Chm.	REA
M. C. Wilson	Ext
H. L. Orr	E&PQ
J. H. Stallings	SCS
Harry E. Ratcliffe	FCA
Clyde F. Clark	PMA
O. L. Mimms	BAE
W. I. Patterson	F&D

PROFESSIONAL CRITERIA

H. Dean Cochran, Chm.	FS
C. H. Pals	BAI
Karl A. Fox	BAE
Marshall J. Goss	AIC
Margaret W. Ayrault	Lib
A. M. Hedges	SCS

PUBLIC SERVICE CRITERIA

Florence L. Hall, Chm.	Ext
Gertrude Drinker	FHA
Fred W. Grover	FS
A. Rex Johnson	FAR
O. E. Reed	BDI
Ada L. Smith	BAI
W. B. Stout	OES

③ **ERRATUM:** Through a regrettable inadvertence, the directory of "Members of the Council for 1949," as published on page 2 of the January OPEDA newsletter, omitted the Bureau of Dairy Industry, which over the years has been consistently and constructively supportive of OPEDA. The voting member for Dairy Industry is Walter M. Swett; the alternate, Harry R. Lochry.

OPEDA'S PRESENT MEMBERSHIP STATUS

OPEDA Membership by Bureaus		OPEDA Membership by States	
Agric. Economics	154	Alabama	22
Ag. & Ind. Chem.	85	Arizona	24
Animal Industry	184	Arkansas	15
Commod. Exch. Ath.	16	California	135
Dairy Ind.	14	Colorado	54
Ent. & Plant Quar.	510	Connecticut	12
Exp. Stations	18	Delaware	2
Extension Serv.	43	Florida	37
Farm Credit	26	Georgia	59
Farmers Home	35	Idaho	25
Food & Drug	12	Illinois	65
For. Agric. Rel.	10	Indiana	28
Forest Service	345	Iowa	42
Information	17	Kansas	8
Library	24	Kentucky	26
Pl. Ind. S.&A.E.	153	Louisiana	65
Prod. & Mar. Admin.	158	Maine	9
Rural Elec. Adm.	99	Maryland	40
Soil Cons. Serv.	719	Massachusetts	18
Ag. Research Adm.	6	Michigan	17
Hu. Nutr. & Home Ec.	4	Minnesota	52
Personnel	4	Mississippi	56
Plant & Opera.	1	Missouri	19
Research Mktg. Ad.	2	Montana	35
Secy's Office	4	Nebraska	67
Weather	6	Nevada	2
Outside USDA	5	New Hampshire	9
Total	*2,654	New Jersey	41
		New Mexico	38
		New York	32
		North Carolina	38
		North Dakota	7
		Ohio	33
		Oklahoma	67
		Oregon	58
		Pennsylvania	87
		South Carolina	83
		South Dakota	10
		Tennessee	15
		Texas	127
		Utah	47
		Vermont	7
		Virginia	53
		Washington	48
		West Virginia	4
		Wisconsin	127
		Wyoming	10
		Washington area	724
		Alaska	18
		Hawaii	4
		Puerto Rico	23
		Mexico	8
		Canal Zone	1
		Japan	1
		Total	*2654

* These figures may be increased by the 424 members for 1948 who have not yet paid their 1949 dues.

OPEDA'S FINANCIAL STATUS

Receipts	
Balance on hand January 1, 1949	\$4,259.75
Receipts, January 1 to May 31, 1949	2,584.25
	<hr/>
	\$6,844.00
Disbursements	
Salaries	\$1,270.06
Printing OPEDA	254.45
Mimeograph and Addressograph service	227.45
Postage	107.16
Office expenses and supplies	164.53
Miscellaneous	8.30
	<hr/>
Total expenses	\$2,031.95
Balance on hand May 31, 1949	4,812.05
	<hr/>
	\$6,844.00

MULTIPLE TAXATION

Some months ago Herbert M. McMahan of E&PQ, Goldsboro, N. C., wrote an interesting letter on this subject, which was squeezed out of the January OPEDA but continues to be of vital interest. It is as follows: "I am taking the liberty to pass along my sentiments and desires concerning taxation of federal pay by states to which a federal employee is assigned. Such a bill prohibiting this practice was favorably reported to the full committee in April 1948. (H.R. 127.)

"With the passing of the 80th Congress I have seen no further reports in our 'Kneipp Letters.' I sincerely hope that a similar bill is placed before the present Congress, and that OPEDA backs it to the limit. There is no fairness under the present setup, for some states have unreasonably low exemptions and high rates, whereas others still have liberal exemptions and low rates. As a federal employee you are subject to the tax system of any state to which you are assigned, be it good or bad. In the Southern States some have higher

poll tax than others; some have state income tax, whereas others have none, or high exemptions. The same goes for personal property tax and automobile licenses. Because of this wide variation in taxing systems, I think it is only fair to subject federal employees to that system existing in his home state, for he is subject to be moved from one state to another on short notice.

"If this letter could be used to stimulate interest that might lead to correction of the evils in the present taxation setup, I would be very grateful. I think a little investigation would uncover enough inequalities between the various states to convince Congress that federal employees need a new deal, or assurance of elimination of the transfer system, which is impossible."

Two bills on this subject are now pending before the 81st Congress. The House bill, H.R. 1847, was introduced by Representative Wolverton on January 25; the Senate bill, S. 864, by Senator Hendrickson and Senator Smith of New Jersey on February 8. They differ in detail but are similar

in essence. Both stipulate that an officer or employee of the United States shall be subject to state tax only in the state in which he is domiciled and in no event shall be taxed by any state or municipality in which he is neither domiciled nor resides. The bills have been referred to the respective committees on the Judiciary of the two Houses.

Inquiry at the offices of the two committees on June 3 disclosed the fact that thus far no action has been taken on either bill, nor are there any plans for early action in either case. The House bill has been assigned to a subcommittee of which Representative Walter, of Pennsylvania, is chairman, but no hearings have been held or scheduled. Apparently there has been no great pressure for action by either House. In that circumstance the bills could wither on the vine.

The immediate question is whether such legislation is of sufficient importance to OPEDA members to warrant the organization in actively advocating early committee consideration of the pending bills and the enactment

of one or the other by Congress. If enough OPEDA members so state and recommend, all proper means will be employed to bring the importance of

action to the attention of the committees and other members of Congress. If only few or no letters favoring that course are received from OPEDA

members, the logical assumption will be that the subject is not of sufficient importance to justify aggressive action by OPEDA.

THE TRANSMUTATION OF IDEALS

Throughout the two decades of OPEDA history there has been a constant and consistent expression of a three-fold theme: (1) for the employee a means and way of life commensurate with his or her contribution and culture; (2) for the department the highest attainable standards, facilities, and conditions of efficient professional service; and (3) for the public prompt, adequate, economical, courteous, impartial, and efficient response to the reasonable and rational needs and desires of its members. This trinity of reciprocal and compensatory elements is to many members of OPEDA the principal reason for their membership. To them an organization concerned exclusively with the promotion of the material interests of its members would have no appeal—would, in fact, be distasteful.

But were the allegation made that this three-fold reciprocal relationship was more profession than practice, the OPEDA files, over the years, hardly would constitute adequate re-

futation. Those files which relate to item (1) are extensive in both volume and detail; those which relate to items (2) and (3) are not. Yet the record in general makes it evident that among the OPEDA members the consensus is strongly supportive of the long prevailing theme. There is a sincere desire that professional, working, and public service criteria shall be of the highest order practicable within the department's limitations of legal authority, appropriations, and personnel.

Still, abstractions are not enough. Unless they are redeemed, pious professions can in time become negative in their consequences. To be worthwhile, ideals should be transmuted into controlling principles, minimum standards of acceptability, specific procedures, definite courses of action, projects of detailed specification. Only then do they become ponderable, measurable, subject to dispassionate evaluation. Until then the skeptic and the scoffer can give his peculiar talents effective range.

In the January OPEDA newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 1, in connection with the discussion of OPEDA's new standing committees, a tentative or initial effort has been made to convert OPEDA's long range objective into actionable or measurable terms, to be specific as to what is meant by references to better conditions for professional work or better service to the public. It was hoped that considerable numbers of members would record their personal reactions, whether of dissent or approval, but thus far few have done so. Actually, only the members of the standing committees seem to have given the subject much thought, mainly because they are worried by the implications of the outlines.

Because of their detailed presentation of the ultimate objectives toward which OPEDA's activities appear to trend, it seems worth while to repeat here the four categories of criteria and the Code of Ethics as they were published in the January issue of OPEDA. They are as follows:

Economic Criteria

Adequacy to current conditions of:

- Rates of pay:
- Per diem allowances in lieu of travel costs.
- Mileage rates allowed for use of private car in official work.
- Reimbursement of costs incident to transfer of official station.

Safeguarding of future economic security through:

- Allowance and accumulation of annual leave.
- Allowance and accumulation of sick leave.
- Retirement annuities commensurate with reasonable living standards.
- Adequate provision of income during periods of partial or total disability.

Professional Criteria

- Establishment of and adherence to truly professional standards.
- Optimum opportunity for educational progress along professional lines.
- As an official activity. As a personal privilege.
- Assignment affording optimum diversity of experience and scientific research.
- Functional. Geographic. Economic.
- Classification truly expressive of real professional capabilities.
- Efficiency ratings truly and minutely expressive of real accomplishment.
- Personal credit for personal accomplishment.
- Adequate recognition of seniority and effective service.
- Promotions to positions of greater responsibility as rapidly as deserved.
- Demotion or separation only where failure or default is well established.

Public Service Criteria

- Sufficiency, courtesy and impartiality of service to all citizens.
- Provision of technical information in adequate and understandable forms.
- Recognition of all valid public needs in development of plans and programs.
- Fully effective and economical use of personnel, equipment and supplies.
- Avoidance of functional duplication, overlapping and conflict.
- Prompt adoption and wide application of all practicable economies of administration.
- A code of ethics definitely expressive of these public obligations.

Working Criteria

- Adequacy of facilities requisite to satisfactory performance of assigned duties.
- Research Reference Sources Laboratories
- Offices Equipment Supplies
- Constructive and qualified leadership, direction, and supervision.
- Aides or assistants who are fully competent and qualified.
- Unmistakable definitions of purposes toward which assigned duties are directed.
- Clarity of specifications and instructions.
- Supervisory acceptance of responsibility for supervisory decisions.
- Optimum working periods and hours.
- Equitable compensation for necessary overtime work.
- Recognition of personal domestic circumstances when geographic assignments made.

Code of Ethics

1. Honor, always, these basic obligations:
 - To the American people: courteous, impartial and efficient service.
 - To the Government: complete loyalty, full faith, devoted to service.
 - To Management: understanding, support, cooperation.
 - To Associates and Co-workers: fairness, frankness, courtesy, opportunity, recognition, freedom of expression, moral support.
2. Maintain high standards of integrity in both personal and public relationships.
3. Encourage free expression of views of executive or legislative proposals or decisions in matters of public

policy limited only by recognition of the appropriateness of clearly identifying wholly personal opinions having no official status.

4. Accept justifiable criticism and criticize only constructively.
5. Be alert to progressive practices and techniques.
6. Keep informed of new developments and promote them through reading, study, writing and activity in professional societies and other organizations through which this can be accomplished.
7. Subordinate personal ambitions or desires to the performance of official duties.

The proposals under the caption Economic Criteria present no problems. They all have their base in the constitutional right of petition. Judgment as to their validity and acceptability resides generally in the public, specifically in the Congress. Held within reasonable limits they involve no recrimination, reprisal, or retribution.

But the other three captions pose many questions. If the standards they prescribe now all exist in adequate and acceptable degrees, then there is no need for action, nor even

for mention. If those standards do not exist in adequate and acceptable measure, the disclosure of that fact may be a rather painful procedure.

The situation already has been recognized by one of the standing committees. Its tentative solution is to recast the present form of the standards into a form susceptible to individual acceptance and application, as a code of sound principles or a series of articles of faith, with which the individual personally will guide his or her official efforts and actions. The expectation and desire is that in time voluntary personal acceptance will be so general and complete that there

will be no need for organizational dictum or decree. Perhaps the other two committees also will conclude that a similar approach in their respective fields offers greatest promise.

Some day OPEDA may be challenged to prove the sincerity of its professions, to demonstrate that in its proposals, plans and programs the reciprocal considerations of devotion to departmental advancement, to optimum types of service to the public, rank co-equal with the advancement of the material interests of its members. Should such a challenge eventuate, OPEDA should be prepared fully to meet it squarely and convincingly.

SOUL-SEARCHING SUGGESTION

Referring partly to the item "Our Brother's Keeper" in the November issue of the OPEDA newsletter, partly to the list of objectives that accompanied the bills for 1949 dues, Dr. Harry W. Allen, E&PQ, Moorestown, N. J., contributed an interesting comment that would have been run in the January OPEDA had space been available. It is, in part, as follows:

"In my opinion, the enclosed list of subjects is relatively unimpressive, because, with two or three exceptions, it deals only superficially with what is wrong among professional employees. Prof. L. B. Loeb, of the University of California, in a recent issue of 'Science' has put his finger on some of the basic ills of professional government service, which many of us have also recognized long ago. The sickness he describes cannot be cured

by securing more leave, more overtime pay, and such, which in the main are the candy dished out to mere job holders. Furthermore, many of the deficiencies of professional service arise from practices within the service which could not be corrected by law or regulation. In fact, they can only be cured by a great uplift in morale by the well-known methods by which teamwork and pride in outfits are obtained. It would seem that in these channels the OPEDA might well consider the possibility of being to a larger extent its 'brother's keeper' in helping to bring about some needed changes."

This frankly and succinctly expresses a theme that has been widely and variously implied over the years by a considerable number of OPEDA members or by those who took the trouble to explain why they had de-

cided not to be, or had ceased to be, OPEDA members. Viewed collectively and retrospectively, the files of OPEDA reflect a somewhat intangible yet quite real concept of a type of association in which ideals and ethics and professional aspiration equal, if they do not transcend the purely materialistic and mundane considerations. If that desire widely prevails among the 25,000 USDA folks who are eligible to OPEDA membership, the principles and purposes fundamental to OPEDA should be shaped accordingly. Question one is whether this concept of what OPEDA might be is widely shared. Question two is as to the measures through which OPEDA may advance to such a goal. Only you members of OPEDA who read this item can answer those questions. It will be interesting to note the extent to which you do so.

THE WILLIAM A. JUMP MEMORIAL AWARD

No project or program undertaken by the Department of Agriculture should have greater appeal to the members of OPEDA than the recently initiated movement to establish the William A. Jump Memorial Award. Jump personified all of those attributes that typify the ideal professional employee of the USDA: competence, application, vision, loyalty, faith, and integrity. Members of Congress are prone to be skeptical of the virtues of bureaucrats, but Jump commanded their almost unanimous respect and confidence. There can be few professional men and women in the Department of Agriculture today who do not owe to his

memory a large and unsatisfied debt.

Means whereby a partial payment on that debt can be made have now come into being. A fund is now being accumulated with which annually to finance an award to a carefully selected federal government employee, male or female, not more than 32 years of age, in recognition of his or her unusual competence, integrity, interest in public administration, and endowment for leadership. Those were the qualities which Jump constantly sought among the young workers of the department; so, while the award cannot take the place of his fine personality, it can perpetuate his personal practice.

In its minimum concept, the award will take the form of a gold key and

a certificate for exemplary achievement and leadership in public administration. But were the fund large enough, more than one award could be made annually, or the single award could consist not only of a key and a certificate but also of a scholarship or fellowship.

The committee handling the program is made up of some of the outstanding men of the department. William A. (Art) Minor, Assistant to the Secretary, is receiving contributions to the fund. A check addressed to him, payable to the William A. Jump Memorial Award Fund, would be a tangible proof of appreciation of one who made professional work in the Department of Agriculture a vocation of honor and unselfish service.

WHY OPEDA?

Throughout OPEDA's entire history this question has been posed at frequent intervals. The principal query has been as to whether all valid needs of the professional employees of the department would not adequately be served by their membership in the N.F.F.E. or the A.F.L. Federation of Government Employees. Admittedly, those organizations are efficient and effective. Their respective heads are able men, who are on the job, and their greater memberships and means enable them to maintain staff organizations which far surpass OPEDA's modest potential.

Possibly an answer may be found in meetings of the USDA personnel, such as occurred on May 16 in the Honor Award ceremony at the Sylvan Theater at the base of the Washington Monument. Here were gathered 58 members of the department, 5 to receive awards for distinguished service, 53 to receive awards for superior service. Intermingled with them were many of the higher officials of the department and other top-flight agencies; observing them from the audience were many others preeminent in the department's history and record of accomplishment.

As he made each individual award, Secretary Brannan briefly sketched

the recipient's accomplishment—in some cases, some additional background. In richness and diversity the collective record was most impressive. One fact seemed obvious, each man and woman honored was an individualist, each had regarded his or her official duties as transcendent over all other considerations, each had a dominant sense of loyalty to the job.

How fully and satisfactorily would the conventional type of federal employee union represent men and women of such types? Perhaps some of them are members of such unions. Only a small minority of them now are members of OPEDA. Quite naturally, they share the common in-

terest in salary standards, hours and conditions of work, classification, per diem, retirement, disability compensation, annual leave, etc. But equally or even more important to them may be their concern for the progress and

prestige of their bureau, pride in their work, a sense of obligation to their profession, a spirit of public service, a gratitude for opportunity. It is a safe assumption that if or when OPEDA is developed to the limit of

its potentialities it will be a more effective vehicle for the expression of the views, interests, and aspirations of such men and women than will any of the organizations of alternative availability.

Executive Officer's Report—May, 1949

Kneipp Letter No. 6

The Digest of Public General Bills, introduced in the 1st Session of the 81st Congress during the months of January, February, March, and April, 1949, records a large number of bills of interest to federal employees. For example, the index, under the caption "Public Officers and Employees," fills two columns of fine print, with single subjects listing as many as 11 separate bills. Similarly, the caption "Retirement—Civil Service, etc." fills more than a column of the index, with a maximum of 11 bills related to a single subject. Each bill is pregnant with weal or woe to the men or women who are on the federal pay-rolls.

Of course, many such bills are introduced as the easiest way to satisfy the demands of one pressure group or another, without serious intent on the part of the sponsor to exhaust every practical means for their enactment. Sometimes a series of identical bills serves merely to illustrate the range of interest in the particular subject or to catalogue the various members who support the basic proposal. But even after appropriate allowances are made for the bills of such character, the array of pending legislation affecting the federal employees and calling for committee action and consideration by both Houses of Congress is of impressive proportions.

Aside from the basic merits of a particular bill, there is the problem of its angles, ramifications, repercussions, and relationships to other aspects of public policy or legislative program. The indirect consequences of enactment might be infinitely more important than the direct ones. Frequently, the individual viewpoints and philosophies of the members of the committee of jurisdiction have a controlling influence. When it is known in advance that the majority of the committee members are inherently negative to a specific proposal little is gained by extensive hearings.

Thus, in practice, the action program of a committee tends to reduce itself to a series of minor bills clearly innocuous because of self-evident justification and limited effect, and to such of the major bills as are vigorously supported, strongly justified, and not too greatly in conflict with the known views of the majority of the members of the committee. It is this latter class of bills that particularly merits the major attention and effort of an executive officer of an association of professional employees. In the case of bills which obviously will pass on their evident merit, and bills which obviously have no chance of enactment, intervention

yields no appreciable result—may, in fact, diminish the effectiveness of presentations regarding bills of major significance.

But even with the field of action narrowed through the processes described, the progress of legislation of interest to OPEDA has been far from rapid. Individual members of the Senate and House find it difficult to meet their committee obligations. The frequency with which Senate or House meets at 10 or 10:30 a.m., rather than the conventional hour of noon, curtails committee hearings or forces their postponement. Persons programmed for presentation of oral testimony before committees frequently have to be content with the filing of written statements for incorporation in the record—as has twice been the case with your executive officer.

One saving condition is the fact that all pending bills continue to be actionable throughout the entire life of the 81st Congress, or until that body adjourns sine die in 1950, so in addition to the remainder of the current session there will be another full session during which those bills will be subject to enactment. As a matter of practical politics, widely popular bills may well be allowed to go over until next year so that their enactment will not have been forgotten by election day, which might be the case were they enacted now. Then, too, the pendency of a general election may add weight to the views of those who advocate the particular legislative action. Additional time during which members of Congress can more fully familiarize themselves with the details of a bill, or more fully learn the views of their constituents regarding it, often is an important factor. Failure of the present session to enact a bill in which the members of OPEDA are interested may be disappointing, but it need not be disheartening.

The interest of an organization of professional employees in pending or proposed legislation may be positive or it may be negative. Certain bills may be promotive of employee interest; others may quite adversely affect that interest. In the first instance, the function of OPEDA is to apprise the committees of jurisdiction of the ways in which its members will benefit by enactment of the bill and of the facts and circumstances which are believed to justify such enactment. In the second instance, the function will be convincingly to present the negative aspects of the bill and the facts and circumstances which are believed to make its enactment inadvisable. In this latter respect, more,

perhaps, needs to be done than hitherto has been done; more active participation by the entire OPEDA membership may be desirable.

The character and composition of OPEDA membership is such that it would seem comparatively unaffected by some measures which other groups of federal employees may regard as inimical to their interests. Where that assumption seems valid, OPEDA has refrained from expressions of viewpoint. But the possibility exists that some members of OPEDA might be adversely affected. It would be helpful if every member of OPEDA who felt that his or her interests would suffer through enactment of any particular legislative measure would so advise the executive officer. Similarly, it would be helpful if members whose interests would be promoted by pending bills other than those listed as OPEDA objectives would likewise record that fact.

In relation to OPEDA's 1949 objectives the present status is as follows:

● **INCREASED PER DIEM AND AUTO MILEAGE:** Both the House and the Senate have passed H.R. 3005, and the President has signed it, so it is now the law. For travel within the limits of the continental United States the act fixes a maximum of \$9 per day; outside of the United States the rate shall be fixed by the Budget Director. For official use of privately owned automobiles, within or outside designated posts of duty or places of service, the bill authorizes a maximum rate of 7 cents per mile, plus actual costs of ferry rates and bridge, road and tunnel tolls. Provision is made for advances of funds to cover travel costs. The bill should enable the department hereafter satisfactorily to adjust practically every condition of per diem or auto mileage hitherto regarded as inequitable.

● **MORE LIBERAL DISABILITY COMPENSATION:** After extended hearings by a subcommittee, the House Committee on Education and Labor has reported out H.R. 3191, a bill that has White House endorsement. Instead of the current maximum limit of \$116.67, or the recently proposed maximum limit of \$225, the bill establishes a maximum basic compensation limit of 66 2/3 percent of monthly pay in cases of total disability, or 66 2/3 percent of the difference between preinjury and post-injury earnings in the case of partial disability; plus an additional 8 1/3 percent if the disabled employee has one or more dependents. For 21 categories of permanent disability which involve solely the loss, or loss of use, of a member or function of the body, or disfigurement, specific numbers of weeks of compensation are prescribed. Death benefits to wives and children are increased, as are burial payments. On the whole, the bill is an admirable protection to federal

employees. Its one possibly negative feature is the continuation of the principle of noncompensation for the first three days of temporary disability, unless such disability exceeds 21 days in duration or is followed by permanent disability; but it developed that the majority of the state compensation laws embody that principle as a means to prevent malingering and no agency of the United States offered objection to it. The prospects for the enactment of this bill during the present session of Congress appear to be good. Its companion bill in the Senate, S. 1287, is now slated for early hearing by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

● **PAY RAISES:** The pay raise situation is becoming increasingly confused. A state of rigor mortis, due to its own internal conflicts, would not be surprising. During the past year or more the Administration has strongly emphasized the need for higher salaries in the top positions. Bills supportive of that viewpoint, S. 498 in the Senate, H.R. 1689 in the House, and the Armed Service Career Compensation Act, 1949, bill in the House, have had rough sledding. S. 498, reported March 18, so far has been passed over. The House Rules Committee thus far has withheld clearance of H.R. 1689. The House has returned the Armed Services bill to the committee for revision.

Probably the major cause of the present impasse is the widely prevalent feeling that there should be no increases in the higher salary grades that are not shared proportionately by the lower salary grades. The allegations that the proportions of increase in the lower grades have been so much greater in the past as to press them against the intermediate grades, and those against the upper grades, is generally dismissed as unimportant. However, that trend is well established by the testimony of Mr. Baruch before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on May 9, where he explained the variations which have occurred in the ratios between the lowest salary and the highest salary through the operations of the several major classification bills. In the original Classification Act of 1923 the ratio was 8.33; the Welch Act of 1928, 8.8; the Act of 1942, 7.20; the pay bill of 1945, 6.81; the pay bill of 1946, 5.92; and the pay bill of 1948, 5.11. This point did not excite much comment, nor did it find acceptance as a major weakness of the present situation. The important point is that despite all of the means at its disposal, and after a year or more of effort, the Administration so far has been unable to establish a new level of salaries for the highest officials.

Eleven bills to increase salaries in the classified service are now pending before Congress—one, S. 559, in the Senate, the other 10 in the House. The majority propose increases of \$650 per annum for federal and District of Columbia employees; two, \$800 for postal employees and \$500 for others. However, there is no expectation that any of these bills will be given preferred consideration.

To the contrary, attention principally has been concentrated on two

bills which are primarily revisions of the Classification Act of 1923 but which carry small concomitant pay increases and which have been regarded as the most probable vehicles for the general pay increase.

These bills are H.R. 4169, introduced by Representative Tom Murray, chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and S. 1762, introduced (by request) by Senator Russell Long of Louisiana, this latter bill bearing the Administration's stamp of approval.

Both bills have one highly commendatory feature in that they completely abandon the hitherto prevailing \$10,000 (or \$10,330) limit which has been such an obstacle to the development of an orderly pattern of compensation. H.R. 4169 would establish 18 general schedule grades ranging from \$2,100 to \$15,000. S. 1762 would establish 19 general schedule rates ranging from \$2,100 to \$16,000; grade 19 to be filled only by authority of the President, and grades 17 and 18 only by or with the approval of the Civil Service Commission. Other differences between the two bills are that S. 1762 has 5 pay steps in grades 11 to 14 instead of six, and three pay steps in grades 15 to 17 instead of 5, with proportionately larger increases between steps. H.R. 4169 touches on efficiency ratings, whereas S. 1762 does not. Both bills authorize beyond-grade or longevity pay raises for dead-end positions but differ in their language.

Otherwise both bills leave much to be desired. Both not only perpetuate but aggravate the overlapping of grades, which is further complicated by the longevity promotions, the result being that a person in a certain grade might be receiving a higher salary than a person in the second higher grade, probably his superior officer. The 18 GS classifications in the two bills are based largely on adjectives or adverbs subject to a wide variation of interpretation by equally honest and conscientious personnel officers. It seems quite evident that neither bill, were it enacted, actually would do much to improve the present classification situation, beyond raising the existing salary ceiling.

Apparently this is the conclusion reached by the Senate subcommittee of which Senator Long is chairman. According to recent report, the subcommittee has requested Mr. Baruch to write an entirely new bill which will eliminate or at least minimize the overlapping of salary grades and will clarify certain of the bases for grade classification. Combined with this request, however, is a directive to provide an average increase of \$150 per year for the first 11 of the 19 GS grades, one result of which will be to further invade the intermediate and upper grades and further decrease the ratio between the lowest salaried and the highest salaried positions in the classification pattern.

Unless some new and novel approach is devised, the present session conceivably may adjourn without final action on either pay raises or classification. The major factors are rather supportive of that probability. The earlier clamor of extreme hardship due to totally inadequate federal

salaries has markedly subsided. The principal argument now advanced in support of pay raises is that while the cost of living has advanced 71.6 percent since 1940, the average pay increase has been only 46.6 percent. However, this appeal lacks the dramatic effect of earlier representations of malnutrition and dispossession.

Government jobs are growing in desirability with considerable rapidity. The turn-over has been markedly reduced, and there is now less competition for talent by private business. There is a widely prevalent belief that the general level of living costs is due to be reduced at least 10 or 15 percent, creating an equivalent increase in the buying power of present federal salaries. An appreciable reduction in farm income seems already under way. Private industry is working shorter hours, so that even though hourly rates remain unchanged, weekly or monthly incomes are diminishing rather than increasing.

Realism, rather than wishful thinking, would suggest that there is no more than a 50-50 chance that the present session of Congress will act affirmatively either in the matter of general pay increases or a revision of the classification structure. Under present law, Congress is due to adjourn on July 31 and would continue in session after that date only for the consideration of matters of unusual importance. Meanwhile, a tremendous volume of urgently important and vital legislation awaits final action. In these circumstances, the enactment of either a pay raise or a revised classification bill in the next 60 days would require a unanimity of congressional interest and action, of which there is little current evidence.

● RETIREMENT LEGISLATION:

The Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been quite industrious, and the committee has reported out a number of minor bills. However, it still has before it a considerable number of bills upon which hearings have not yet been held, and its ability effectively to dispose of all of those bills within the next 60 days is conjectural.

To OPEDA members the retirement subject of greatest interest and concern is that reflected by the bill S. 1275, introduced by Senator Johnston on March 16. A bill erroneously regarded as a companion bill, namely, H.R. 3839, introduced in the House by Representative Davis of Wisconsin on March 28, embodies a part of the language of S. 1275 but with two quite important departures. First, the scope of the bill is so broadened that if enacted it could be applicable to many times the number of persons that presumably would be affected by S. 1275. Second, H.R. 3839 makes no requirement whatever for deposits in the retirement fund. These two deficiencies alone practically preclude any probability of affirmative action on H.R. 3839. Such hope for affirmative action as may exist seems to lie exclusively in S. 1275.

When that bill was introduced the first question which arose was whether

it conformed to the limitations prescribed by OPEDA's Council in its tentative approval of January 18. Dr. Rand, as chairman of a subcommittee of the OPEDA Committee on Economic Criteria, gave the subject immediate and thorough attention and reported that the bill was within the purview of the council approval—therefore, eligible for full OPEDA support.

On April 2 a half-dozen members of USDA, plus several from other groups, had a quite satisfactory conference with Senator Johnston and his then assistant, Jimmy Lever. The Senator agreed to arrange for an early hearing on S. 1275 by a subcommittee.

Such a hearing was arranged for April 28. Then it developed that more than one-half of the persons who were orally to testify in support of the bill would be absent from Washington on that date and until after May 5. That circumstance left no alternative other than a request for a postponement of the hearing.

Meanwhile, Senator Johnston has been flooded with a volume of correspondence so varied and so great as to cause him some apprehension. An unforeseen and unexpected number of persons and groups contend that they clearly are within the scope of the bill and, therefore, urge its enactment. Another large proportion assert that they do not come within the present scope of the bill but should in equity be included, so they demand the amendment of the bill to unmistakably bring them within its scope.

One interesting aspect has been presented by the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, which has a membership of approximately 22,000 persons. These were all originally state officers or employees, but as a feature of the war program they were all taken over by the federal government and were in the status of federal employees for something more than 5 years. Later they were returned to the states and are now state officers or employees.

Their current status debars them from the operation of S. 1275, unless they later establish a position in the federal service. The conference has in drafted form a bill which would enable the state personnel described to obtain credit under the Federal Retirement Act for their services in the employment field. Instead of immediately introducing that bill, however, their representatives called to inquire whether OPEDA would be willing to concur in an amendment of S. 1275 under which the 22,000 people in the state employment work could get retirement credit. In such event, the Interstate Conference would join forces with OPEDA in support of the common bill.

The representatives were told that S. 1275 now represents the maximum liberalization of the retirement act that the majority of the OPEDA members would support, and that OPEDA not only could not agree to a compromise bill such as proposed but would have to oppose it were it to be introduced.

In relation to S. 1275, the Senate committee solicited reports and rec-

ommendations from the three major agencies that deal with personnel matters, namely, the Civil Service Commission, the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget. The Comptroller General's report was dated April 14; the report of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, April 27; and the report of the Assistant Director of the Budget, while undated, was received by the committee on June 9. All three of these reports are wholly negative to enactment of the bill. The reasons against such enactment as collectively presented by the three reports may be digested or summarized as follows:

Scope of Bill: No information as to number of federal employees now eligible for benefits proposed by bill, nor as to number of potentially eligible employees, but provision in 1950 budget of approximately \$2,500,000,000 of federal aid to states and local governments is indication that numbers of potentially eligible employees must be large. Bill would encumber federal retirement system with the burden of non-federal service selected on somewhat arbitrary and preferential grounds, thus establishing a precedent and opening way for subsequent inclusion by similar legislation of other types of service not rendered for the United States.

Status of Federal Funds Allocated to States: Federal government lends monetary and other aids to the several states in their development of certain specified types of programs. Although federal funds are used, these programs are essentially state functions, and employees engaged in their administration are employees of the state government. Generally, funds paid or granted to a state for performance of functions or conduct of programs, after receipt by state, are held to be state funds. Employees compensated by funds so derived fundamentally are in no different status in relation to the state government than are others of its employees engaged in other functions and compensated from state-raised revenues.

Discrimination Between Different Types of State Employees: Selection by bill of a certain class of former state employees appears to discriminate against other former state employees now in the federal service. To allow credit for state service paid for in part by federal funds, and at the same time to deny credit for other state service, is believed to be discriminatory. No sound reason appears to exist for preferring in the federal service one class of former state employees over another.

Bill Inconsistent with Principles Underlying Other Similar Legislation: Bill would authorize credit for same service under both federal and state annuity systems, a privilege which is expressly denied by other bills similarly proposing retirement credit for federal-state cooperative activities. In reports on pending bill S. 702, for crediting certain service performed in the employment of carriers under federal control during World War I, reasons have been advanced against the allowance of such credit. The reasons urged against allowance of credit for service with private indus-

try appear equally valid with respect to service with state governments.

Scope and Purpose of Federal Retirement Act: The present Civil Service Retirement Law was designed as a system for the retirement of federal and District of Columbia employees. It was intended to be in the nature of a reward for faithful service to the government. Accordingly, the general allowance of retirement credit beyond that scope would not be appropriate.

Possibility of Reciprocal Programs: No apparent reason why the federal government should assume liability for employer's portion of annuity for periods during which service was rendered as an employee of a state or a political subdivision thereof. However, a reciprocal arrangement with the state under which service credit would be interchangeable between the federal and the various state retirement systems is believed to be justifiable, or at least to merit consideration.

These foregoing negative considerations are listed not to discourage the supporters of S. 1275 but to apprise them of the challenges which must be met with convincing factual data. Those familiar with the past record of federal-state cooperation undoubtedly can think up numerous adequate answers to the representations listed above. It is highly desirable that they should do so.

In view of the foregoing, it is no more than natural that the Senate committee should now view S. 1275 with an increased degree of caution and curiosity.

● **P. S. — HOLD EVERYTHING:** After the foregoing was put in type, Senator Johnston's office announced that the hearing on S. 1275 had been set for Monday, June 20, at 10 a.m. Nine members of the USDA, plus the executive officer, were found to be available for that date; and two members of ECA, previously of USDA, also signified their desire to make oral statements to the subcommittee. Thanks to Senator Johnston, who personally presided as chairman and whose courtesy and patience were noteworthy, the proceedings were quite satisfactory—the only jarring note being the testimony of the representatives of the Civil Service Commission, Messrs. Irons and Talbot, who appeared in opposition to the bill and recommended that the committee should not report it out.

Those speaking in support of the bill were Stanley B. Fracker, Erwin C. Elting, M. A. McCall, Thomas L. Ayers, James H. Talbert (who represented the Spartanburg, S. C., OPEDA Chapter), and your executive officer. J. L. Boatman of Extension, Frate Bull of FHA, Clyde Clark of PMA, and James L. Robinson of FCA also were present with intent to make oral statements, when the buzzer announcing the convening of the Senate signaled the approaching termination of the hearing but they compromised by submitting their statements, fortunately in written form, for incorporation in the record. J. Joe Reed, of ECA, who had to leave before he could be reached, and D. V. Stapleton, also of ECA, who had no prepared statement, were authorized to submit

statements for inclusion in the record.

These various oral and written statements are believed clearly to record all of the facts, circumstances, and considerations of equity and equality hitherto advanced by the supporters of the proposal. Thus, the case has now been placed in full detail before one House of the Congress. The hearings, when printed, will constitute adequate bases for subsequent discussion by supporters of the measure and for decision by the various members of the Congress who sooner or later may have to vote on it.

Sufficient numbers of copies of the hearings to give them wide distribution among the members of OPEDA cannot be obtained by this organization, but an individual member who desires a copy possibly may obtain one by a request to the Senator with whom he is best acquainted that a copy of the hearings on S. 1275, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on June 20, be obtained and sent to him. The supply of hearings may not be large enough to meet all such requests, but such recordation of individual interest in the subject would have some value.

Irons, of the Civil Service Commission, told the subcommittee that the enactment of S. 1275, in relation only to persons now in federal employ, would cost the United States \$21,000,000. He said the average cost per individual employee for an average period of 10 years would be \$3,500 and, since there were 6,000 such employees, the 10-year cost would be \$21,000,000. Dr. Fracker, who spoke later presented a quite logical and convincing analysis of the most recent statistics through which he arrived at an estimated cost of \$300 per year per person for about 4,800 persons. The executive officer's statement was based on \$450 per person per year for 5,000 persons. Thus, 3 quite divergent approaches neverthe-

less showed a somewhat surprising coincidence, namely, that the probable result of S. 1275 would be an average annual increase of about \$350 in the annuities of those who could qualify under its provisions.

To support his thesis that S. 1275 would have an incalculable effect, Mr. Irons cited the WPA as an example of a single federal program which might make large numbers of persons eligible for greatly increased annuities. Dr. Fracker quite effectively answered that implication by stressing the almost wholly federal character of the WPA program, the relatively negligible number of state employees connected with it, and the past decisions that work relief project workers were not creditable under the retirement act. He pointed out that the proposed legislation would not affect the retirement status of former WPA employees in any way, since S. 1275 relates only to persons who are or have been state employees.

Were further proof needed of the value and potency of OPEDA Regional Chapters, the presence at the hearing of James H. Talbert, representing the Spartanburg, S. C., Chapter, supplied it. His statement was highly effective, not alone because of his presentation and personality but also because he represented 70 professional men, remote from the Washington scene, whose chapter meetings have afforded full opportunity to consider all individual viewpoints and to determine majority opinion.

There is little probability that S. 1275 will be enacted this year; the Congress is too near adjournment to get the bill through both committees and both Houses. Then, too, it was announced that a member of the Senate intends to propose an amendment under which the bill would authorize retirement credit for the Employment Service employees, which might confuse the issue and obstruct early action. A conservative appraisal of the June 20 hearing would be that it will

facilitate action early in the next session of Congress, provided that considerations negative to enactment are not allowed to obscure or dominate considerations favorable to the bill.

● **UNION CONTROL OF FEDERAL SERVICES:** On March 22 Representative Rhodes introduced H.R. 3702, providing for recognition of the rights of officers and representatives of government employees' organizations to present employee grievances, to confer with administrative officers on matters of policy affecting working conditions, etc., to solicit membership, collect dues, etc. For a while the bill slumbered. Then the Civil Service Commission reported that it saw no objection to the bill's enactment. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, therefore, reported the bill to the full committee with recommendations for approval. That precipitated one of the most controversial developments that now occupies Washington attention. Certain groups are contending that the bill if enacted would give certain employee unions absolute control of the personnel and promotion and appeals procedures of the federal agencies; would enable them to shape or at least to influence major policy, etc. The Civil Service Commission has now asked the House committee to defer action.

Whether enactment of the bill would have the dire results which its opponents now prophesy is perhaps debatable. In any event, the existence of such dire results could hardly be more than ephemeral and might serve to clarify the atmosphere and stabilize sound federal personnel policy. So far OPEDA has refrained from taking part in the fracas, but some of the other employee organizations and some of the unorganized employees are now classing the proposal as a major menace to the administrative integrity of the governmental agencies.

● **BARGAIN MEMBERSHIP RATES:** Under the rule approved by the Council on October 28, 1948, a new applicant for OPEDA membership during July, August, or September can pay dues for the remainder of 1949 and all of 1950 by one single remittance of \$3.